IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.R.RAMAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 21ST MARCH 2007 / 30TH PHALGUNA 1928

RP.No. 244 of 2007(T)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.28931/2006
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/2ND RESPONDENT:

RAJU K.M., AGED 41 YEARS,
S/O. MATHAI, RESIDING AT KANDAMPARAPUTHENPURAYIL HOUSE,ELANGAVAM,VAREPETTY P.O.,KOTHAMANGALAM TALUK ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.PEEYUS A.KOTTAM

RESPONDENTS: PETITIONER & RESPONDENTS NO.1,3 & 4:
---

1. SUSEELA GOPALAN, W/O. GOPALAN,
   AGED 54 YEARS, MULAMATTATHIL HOUSE, ELANGAVAM,
   VARAPETTY P.O., ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

2. THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
   ELECTRICAL SUB DIVISION, K.S.E.B., MUVATTUPUZHA.

3. ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MAGISTRATE,
   COLLECTORATE, ERNAKULAM.

4. KARUNAKARAN,S/O. KANDAN KONTHY,
   KUNNUPURATH HOUSE,NOW RESIDING AT OLIYAKKUDY HOUSE
   KADUMPADI KARA, ENANELLOOR VILLAGE, MUVATTUPUZHA
   TALUK, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.K.J.KURIACHAN
R2 BY SRI.JOSE J.MATHEIKEL, SC, KSEB
R4 BY ADV.SMT.M.M.JASMINE

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 21/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

P.R.RAMAN, J.

R.P.NO.244 OF 2007 IN
W.P.(C).NO.28931 OF 2006

Dated this the 21st day of March, 2007

O R D E R

This is a petition seeking review of the judgment in W.P.(C). No.28931/2006. The petitioner herein is the 2nd respondent in the writ petition. Actually the writ petition was filed by one Suseela Gopalan seeking modification of the order passed by the Additional District Magistrate, Ernakulam in the matter of drawing the electric line to the 2nd respondent (review petitioner). The modification was made as per the judgment, after taking into consideration of the affidavit filed by Karunakaran (4th respondent) and the prayer made on behalf of the writ petitioner. In the matter of drawing the electric line, there was no occasion either for the District Magistrate or for this Court to consider the aspect regarding compensation if any payable under law. That being not the subject matter of the writ petition and at any rate in the absence of any legal obligation on the part of the petitioner to pay the same, there is no ground for review of the judgment.

Review Petition is dismissed.

P.R.RAMAN,
Judge.

kcv.